UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, called the 773rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 14, 2017 at 3:33 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: According to Section 3-1-1 of the Bylaws of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Faculty Senate, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall be elected from among the members of the tenure-system faculty to serve a term of three years. Secretary Peterson’s term ends in 2018 and the Faculty Senate Bylaws stipulate that, prior to the first of January of the year in which the Secretary’s term expires, or whenever for other reasons the office falls vacant, the Chancellor shall appoint a special nominating committee of three members of the Senate. I’m here to announce that I have appointed the following Senators to serve as the Special Nominating Committee for the Faculty Senate: Lisa Green of Linguistics, David Gross of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, and Brian Ogilvie of History. Brian Ogilvie has agreed to serve as the Chair of the Committee, which is responsible for nominating candidates to fill the position of Secretary and will report its nomination to the Senate no later than the first regular meeting in March. So, I’d like to thank these Senate colleagues for agreeing to do this very important work of recommending institutional leaders who will continue to invest in our “Top 20” vision. Thank you.

John McCarthy, Acting Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Thank you. I think that most of you saw the announcement of the new Five College Executive Director, Sarah Pfatteicher; I was on the search committee. Sarah is currently an Associate Dean at the University of Wisconsin in Madison at the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. She is actually a historian of science whose research is on structural failure, engineering failure; her first professional publication was on the collapse of the walkways at the Hyatt Regency. She, I think, will do a very capable job and do some very important work as the Five College Executive Director when she replaces Neal Abraham, who is retiring.

At the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday, a number of our faculty were tenured: Marjorie Rubright of English, Eric Berlin of Music, Gülru Çakmak of History of Art and Architecture, Elizabeth Chang of Music, Ayano Kataoka of Music, Gregory Spirodopoulos of Music, Lili He of the College of Natural Sciences and Food Science, and Jianhua Yang of Electrical and Computer Engineering. Congratulations to all of our colleagues who were tenured last Friday.

If you read my emails, you saw that we have announced two new programs: a new program to improve the diversity of the tenure-system faculty through a hiring program and also a spouse-partner hiring program that has not just a process but also a small amount of money attached to it. If you missed those emails or just deleted them reflexively because they came from my Office, they’re on the Provost’s website in the area just below faculty hiring processes.

I have asked the Deans of the Colleges, the Graduate School, the Honors College, and the Libraries to prepare three-to-five-year, high-level planning documents with goals and to send them to me by the end of the Spring 2018 semester. I think that those documents will give some sense of the overall goals of the Colleges and the Deans will be working with their Chairs and faculty on that. Finally, we have been in some conversations with the Retired Faculty Association about some version of the emeritus academy; Vice Provost Tillman Wolf is now my delegate to continue in those discussions. There’s nothing yet to report about that but we’re working toward it. Thank you.
Andrew Mangels, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance: Here is a quick update on the meningitis vaccinations. We’ve vaccinated over 7,000 students and we still don’t know how many students actually got vaccinated outside of University Health Services (UHS), but we had four days of vaccination clinics that were held in the Campus Center. I just want to thank the College of Nursing in particular; there were 40 Nursing students per day who were helping us do the vaccinations. Anybody who went over and saw how quickly the students could move through would have realized that it was quite an effort. We also had about 15 of our student emergency medical technicians helping direct people around as well as a lot of staff from UHS and Environmental Health and Safety coordinating that. There are still smaller clinics being held at UHS which, I understand, are also operating effectively so I encourage any students who have not already gotten vaccinated to please get vaccinated. The students who have been vaccinated will have to come back and get a second vaccination after 28 days in order for the vaccination to be complete.

Martina Nieswandt, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement: Good afternoon. I’m happy announce that, during the fall semester, we have four new centers and institutes on the campus who have interim approval from the UMass President’s Office: the Center for Community Health Equity Research, Director Susan Shaw, in the School of Public Health and Health Sciences; Center for Employment Equity, Director Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; the Center for Student Success Research, Director Ryan Wells, in the College of Education; and the Institute of Diversity Sciences, Director Nilanjana Dasgupta, in the College of Natural Sciences, although the Institute, since it spans multiple Colleges, reports to the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Research and Engagement.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: We’re getting toward the end of term and I know people’s thoughts, when they haven’t been in a freezing building, are on finishing the semester and enjoying some time off, but I do want to say that there is a fair amount of Senate business going on in the Councils and that things will be coming forward in an orderly fashion in the Spring. More significantly, we had a special election in District 17 and I have the great joy of welcoming a new Senator, Janice Telfer from Veterinary and Animal Sciences. She is an Associate Professor and she is also the Undergraduate Program Director. She does research on things called RUNX transcription factors in human and animal immune system. These effect the way that genes express and DNA gets translated around in the cells. If everything works well with these things, it’s fine, but when things go wrong, some critter gets cancer, so this is very interesting, very complex, right at the cutting edge of science research that she does. I welcome our new Senator and the perspectives that she’s going to bring to the deliberations of this body.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee: Your Rules Committee met twice since our last Senate meeting. At one of those meetings, we discussed the selection of a designee for the CPARC membership slot for the Rules Committee Chair because I will be on sabbatical next semester and that’s one thing I don’t want to do and I’m happy to say that Eliot Moss from Computer Science has agreed to do that; he will be the designee. We had some discussions about the weeklong Thanksgiving break as well as the early date for withdrawal with a grade of “W” that’s on the academic calendar. Based on some comments from some of our colleagues, we decided that later on, sometime next semester perhaps, we’ll have University Registrar Patrick Sullivan in to a Rules Committee meeting to have a discussion about those two topics with us. At that same meeting, Professor Sigrid Schmalzer from the History Department joined us to discuss some concerns that she has heard about the Senate’s academic grievance procedures; we had a nice discussion about that. At the other meeting, the second one I alluded to, we discussed a proposed ad hoc committee on
language requirement, which, of course, is on today’s agenda; we fleshed that out a bit. We discussed a draft consensual relationship policy in response to a request from our Provost for comments on it. We also met with the administration this past Monday, December 11. As the Provost just told you, he has a couple of new policies out there so he has to have some background on the revised spousal as well as the special opportunity appointments policies. Also, we wanted to hear something about what’s going on currently with the Shorelight program as well as future prospects in regard to that program. He had some comments about the emeritus academy, as he mentioned, and also some comments about the current title we have of emeritus professor, so there may be some things that you’ll be hearing at a later Senate meeting this year. Additionally, we got a nice report on the deferred maintenance that is still a plague for our campus as well as the background on the drivers of the costs for renovations that are necessary to ameliorate that deferred maintenance. Thank you.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

David Hoagland, Delegate to the Board of Trustees: I’m your new Delegate. I was elected at the last Faculty Senate meeting, which I was unable to attend, so thank you. The Board of Trustees, as you know, met last week. Associate Delegate Billings and I attended events and the Board meeting itself. I’m going to give you a couple of highlights. The meeting opened with a presentation of the Lowell campus’s five-year strategic plan; it was extremely slick. I don’t know how we can match that but UMass Amherst will get its chance at the next Board meeting which will be held here in the Spring. A couple points that I learned from that presentation were that the Lowell campus now has 20,000 students and that they have reached 60% six-year graduation rate, well ahead of their target for reaching that rate. The Board of Trustees meeting focused very much on financial matters as you would expect. The campus and the system have narrow reserves compared to peers so capital projects are probably going to be petering down because our borrowing capacity is not so great. There was a lot of discussion about the problems at the UMass Boston campus and how they might be solved; it looks like they are in a tough situation. Lastly, the Board of Trustees emphasized repeatedly their interest in online efforts to enhance revenue and not just by standard online courses but by any other means that online technologies can be used; it was mentioned that UMass Lowell has opened a satellite campus to support their online efforts, so we need to think creatively because that seems to be a principal area of revenue growth.

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees: Thank you. To supplement what David said, the Board of Trustees will be here on this campus on April 5th and 6th, I believe. So, pursuant to what the Provost was just saying about the Deans being asked to develop their big strategic plans for the next period of time, we’ll be talking about that at that particular meeting. After Board of Trustees meetings, we always have an Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) meeting and it’s always interesting to talk with colleagues at the other campuses and find out what the highlights are: in this case, for the Boston campus, the financial issues they have there. We invited UMass Building Authority Chair Victor Woolridge to come and Henry Thomas, who has also been a Board of Trustees member, is the Building Authority Vice Chair so our system is very well-represented in that particular group. Woolridge talked about what the University has in place for capital planning, how they do the checks and balances, and he’s very eloquent when it comes to speaking about real estate development and those kinds of things, some of the assets that we have not actually had on the Board of Trustees in the past so it’s really good to see that kind of stewardship being taken for the work that’s being done. Again, Victor mentioned the emphasis on online education and really being enthusiastic about the University as a whole moving forward, adapting to changes and things like that, and I think that this campus is a good example for the system. Thank you.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Eve Weinbaum, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: Thank you. I’d like to give an update on contract negotiations, which I know people have been asking about, and a couple of other things we’re working on. We are still in the midst of negotiations. We expected to be done a year ago this month. We’ve been bargaining for about 18 months now. We’re still waiting for a written offer on salaries; we haven’t gotten any although we’ve discussed it. We actually have filed charges against the UMass President’s Office because this is a system-wide issue – it’s not unique to our campus – and we’re going to
have a hearing on Monday at the Department of Labor Relations; we’re hoping we can move things along that way.

We were at the Trustees meeting on Friday, as well, and we asked for their help in advocating for state funding for the University, as we usually do, including the “Fair Share Amendment.” We pointed out that, if you look at per-student investment in higher education by the state, there’s been a 33% drop since 2001, so we’re teaching with a full third fewer resources per student than we had at that time. UMass system President Martin Meehan was in the news because he had given a 2.5% annual raise to the employees in the President’s Office and, when he was questioned about it, he said that that was less than the cost of living and that was lower than average, so we agreed with him and encouraged him to match the cost of living for faculty and staff.

We are working on a number of other issues at the same time including working with the administration to change the anomaly process. We’re hopeful that we can replace it with something that we’re hoping to call an equity program; that would be much more clear and transparent and would really address inequities in pay. We’re also talking a lot about workload and professional development for non-tenure-track faculty. We’ve been talking about sexual harassment and Title IX and how the Massachusetts Society of Professors (MSP) can be part of finding solutions for those problems. We’ve also been talking a lot about academic freedom, which, we’re hearing more and more from our members, is a concern. We’ve been having “Solidarity Wednesdays” and you probably received an email from us yesterday inviting you to send holiday cards to the President’s Office; we are wishing them a happy holiday season and reminding them that fair raises would make everyone feel better and have a better holiday. Happy holidays. Thanks.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

**Senator Marta Calás:** If this topic has already been addressed and I am ignorant of that, so be it, but I am not sure that this question has been asked. The question is about the new evaluation, the new SRTI online system. Is the new system being adopted for a period of experimentation, to see how it goes for a certain period of time in contrast to the prior system, or is this change from paper to electronic form a done deal? I don’t know how it is in your department, but in mine, and in my School, actually, the response to Item 11 on the questionnaire is the only one that counts for almost everybody to get any credit in merit evaluation for the question of how well do we teach. So, it’s a single item, Item 11; it’s being looked at, it’s being talked about, and, most of the time, that’s what counts. Maybe in your School or College or Department things are different. There is another element of the faculty prerogative in terms of when to actually administer the survey. In the new system, it was basically decided that at any point during a certain period the student can do the evaluation online. In the prior system, an envelope with the paper evaluation forms appeared in my mailbox. In my class, because of the developmental nature of the class itself, I tend to do the evaluations at the very end of the semester when the students have experienced the whole class and can really tell how much they learned. From my perspective, and this is probably a perspective that most of us share, the idea of the evaluation is to get a sense of whether the students are learning, and I think that evaluations should be related to how much a student knows or feels that he or she learned. Therefore, I am very concerned about this change. In many ways, it has changed my conditions of work because now I have no control over when the evaluations occur and, basically, there is no longer any relationship between the evaluation and how I actually expect my students to evaluate the course, which is in terms of how much they are learning. So, I would like somebody to tell me if this is an experiment that will then be correlated to how the evaluations were working in the prior format or if this is in a done deal in which, somehow, the expediency of the system is a good representation of student learning. Thank you.

**John McCarthy, Acting Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:** I’m no expert in what is going on, but Martha Stassen, the Director of the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment, has been leading this effort. I have a couple of thoughts about this. First, there is constant, repeated experimentation in the timing of this online SRTI. There was an extension of the time that evaluations are available with the obvious goal of raising the participation rate; you don’t want it to be open for too short a time but you don’t want it to be available too early in the semester or too late in the semester after grades are available to students. So, she is looking at the possibilities and comparing the current year with previous years and that
is still, to some extent, I think, a work in progress. I believe it is also possible to have the students do the survey in class on their phones. It’s pretty easy. Have any of the students here taken the surveys in class on their phones? So, yes, you can actually control when it happens by having students take the surveys on their phones during class. The third thing that I want to say about this is that departments should never use SRTI’s as the sole way of evaluating teaching and they certainly shouldn’t use Question 11 as the only way of evaluating teaching. That is made extremely clear in my promotion and tenure memo that went out in September and that point applies equally to decisions about merit increases.

**Senator Curt Conner:** I have a comment and then a question. The 12th through the 20th of December is our exam period. It’s also Hanukkah. In order to give us the free week for the week of Thanksgiving, we covered Hanukkah with our exam period. We ought to consider that in the future in order to be as kind as we can be toward all members of our community and not just the ones who want to take the whole week off for Thanksgiving. My question is why don’t we consider charging no tuition for graduate students? The reason for that is, as you know, we rebate that tuition for virtually all of our graduate students anyway; if there was no tuition charged, graduate students wouldn’t have to pay tax on that rebate. Thank you.

**Provost McCarthy:** The clause in the tax bill that was going to make graduate student tuition waivers taxable is out of the current draft, so we do not expect that clause to be included in the bill that is reported out of the conference committee or for there to be any issue about taxation of waivers.

C. CREATION OF AN AD HOC COMMITTEE TO BE NAMED THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY


**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Language Proficiency, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-015.

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** What is the charge of the proposed ad hoc committee?

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** The charge is to study the place of second language proficiency in the overall design of undergraduate curricula by reviewing current language proficiency policies at peer institutions, by reviewing through wide consultations with campus constituencies including, among others, academic deans, associate deans, and chief undergraduate advisors in the various Colleges and Departments; undergraduate program directors; the departments, programs, and centers providing language instruction to undergraduate students; the campus administration and student governance bodies; the current patterns of language proficiency and instruction on this campus, and reviewing current campus policies relating to language proficiency and instruction on this campus, and make recommendations to the Academic Matters Council, the General Education Council, the Program and Budget Council, and the administration regarding such changes, if any, in patterns of instruction or policy, as it concludes, will advance the University’s goals in this area.

**Susan DeGrave, Graduate Student:** I am a teaching assistant and I am absolutely thrilled to be embarking on a second career as a teacher of French and also Spanish after over twenty years as an immigration lawyer, a career that I was happy to leave behind although I still do some pro-bono work. Thirty years ago I studied in Paris, France during my junior year at Middlebury and it was one of the most incredible experiences I have ever had. The only way that I could have done that was by speaking French. I know that the Political Science Department is considering the suppression of the language requirement for reasons and I’ve been given a couple of different versions but I’d like to keep this within three minutes. I studied at the University of Paris and would not have been able to take the courses there if I was not pretty good in French. I know that one reason given was that undergraduate transfer students seeking to fulfill their majors in Political Science or Sociology can’t fit it in languages.
**Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** Excuse me, if I may interject here. We are considering a motion to create a committee to look into the language instruction issue. What I believe you were referring to is the second, related motion which will deal with the requirements in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

**Susan DeGrave, Graduate Student:** Well, perhaps I can just make my comment because I am going to teach immersion kindergarten French and I have to leave. I just want to say that, in terms of both subjects, and I certainly support the committee, the reason that was given was that the students are too busy and I also heard that they could not get into the sections, particularly Spanish, so I believe that the solution would be to have more instructors, as a plea for French, and I know I only have three minutes and I don’t want to go over. I would second the motion but I am not a standing member of the Faculty Senate. Merci.

**Senator Graciela Monteagudo:** I wish to speak in favor of the motion to create the committee and also to explain the reasoning behind why some of us in the faculty think that this is important. We are all trying very hard at this University to make it into the top twenty public universities in the country. I think that that is a very important goal for us to achieve and we are working toward it. I think we need to look at how we achieve that goal and also consider what markers will be identified as we do this work. In that sense, I believe that this committee could really serve a very important purpose since the committee will not only be looking at the needs of departments and colleges that currently require languages but at the needs of the whole campus. If the Faculty Senate approves this motion, we would also be looking into what other big state universities offer in the matter of language because we believe that this is something that parents care for, whether we teach languages or not, so it would probably be important for the administration to take this into account as they think about how to increase enrollment and how also to increase the student experience so that we can actually continue to improve as we have been doing. So, I thought that I should speak in favor of this motion. In case people have questions or concerns, this committee would look into the topic of language proficiency with regard to the whole of the campus and talk to many people to find out what exactly would best meet the needs of our students and what would best represent the University as a whole, taking into account what other universities are doing, and also the viewpoints of the parents who are paying the costs of attendance for the students. Thank you.

**Katie, Undergraduate Student:** This my first year at UMass and I am studying Chemistry now but I am looking to minor in French. I have been learning French since I was very young because I had the really lucky opportunity to grow up in a family that values language and I think that it’s important for all students to have the opportunity that I had to learn French or another language because that opens up your world. We live in a world that is globalized; we can travel and everyone has the opportunity to travel if they want to. To take away the opportunity to be able to communicate with other people when we do travel doesn’t make any sense. So, if you’re trying to push this broader agenda of a globalized world, how can we expect students to keep up in this world if they aren’t able to communicate? That’s just my two cents. I really care about these programs and think that everyone should have access to them. If you start cutting them from the requirements, that wouldn’t be right for the middle class because you shouldn’t have to go to a private school to take language classes. It’s not right. Thank you.

**Professor Jim Hicks, Chair of the International Studies Council:** I teach in Comparative Literature and also chair the International Studies Council (ISC) as of this year. I won’t make a long speech; I spoke at a previous Faculty Senate meeting so you know that I support this motion. I just want to say that the ISC, in general, is very strongly in favor of this committee and sees it as actually a keystone for the University’s mission of internationalization; we don’t see how one can internationalize in English only. Thank you.

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** It strikes me that the work of this committee bears on the issue of academic priorities so I move to amend the motion to include the Academic Priorities Council (APC) as one of the Councils to which the work will be referred.

**Senator Bruce Baird:** We currently have in the charge that a member of the APC will be on this ad hoc committee. So, I’m still confused about what is being asked in addition to placing someone from the APC on the committee.
Senator Richard Bogartz: The amendment would add the APC to the list of Councils that will receive and consider the recommendations.

The motion to amend was adopted.

The main motion was adopted as amended.

D. NEW COURSES

CONSENT AGENDA
[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 186</td>
<td>Using Data Structure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATALAN 431</td>
<td>Contemporary Theater in Spain and Catalonia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 272</td>
<td>Democracy and Citizenship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH 357</td>
<td>Spanish for Hospitality and Tourism Professions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH 431</td>
<td>Contemporary Theater in Spain and Catalonia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER 105H</td>
<td>Drama &amp; the Media</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 514</td>
<td>Algorithms for Data Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 622</td>
<td>Embedded Systems: Design, Modeling &amp; Verification</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 647</td>
<td>Security Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 656</td>
<td>Introduction to Cryptography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 674</td>
<td>Green Computing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 678</td>
<td>Data Analytics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 682</td>
<td>Microwave Systems Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 698N</td>
<td>Clinical Nurse Leader: Care Environment Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 637</td>
<td>Reproductive Epidemiology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses COMPSCI 186, CATALAN 431, POLISCI 272, SPANISH 357, SPANISH 431, THEATER 105H, COMPSCI 514, E&C-ENG 622, E&C-ENG 647, E&C-ENG 656, E&C-ENG 674, E&C-ENG 678, E&C-ENG 682, NURSING 698N and PUBHLTH 637, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA
[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda].


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) a Revision to the Minor in Natural Resources Conservation; and 2) a Revision to the History (BA) Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 18-016 and 18-017, respectively.

The motion was adopted.

3. Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-018.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-018.

The motion was adopted.

F. OLD BUSINESS


Amena Moinfar, Graduate Student: Hello. I am a graduate student and teacher in the French Department; this is my third semester here. I’d like to talk about the fact that the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) wants to get rid of language requirements. I would like to thank UMass for accepting me as a graduate student. I feel very fortunate to be in a place where sciences are thriving so much but, at the same time, I can still find a Department of Comparative Literature and meet colleagues from Asian Studies and I think that is fantastic. I in the global world where we live, sciences and humanities should not be enemies; we should collaborate with each other. Diversity on this campus does not only include gender and race and religion but different disciplines. I am a little afraid about this path because I see the President who you have in office right now; he is trying to isolate your country on the international scene. Diversity is also about languages and, to be a global citizen, you need to speak and study several languages. Some students have trouble getting into language courses because we lack the manpower, so why don’t you give us more manpower? Or, maybe, we could have classes that are geared toward the SBS students, such as psychology or speech pathology courses in French; these may be more useful and less tedious for those who are resentful about taking those language requirements. The solution is not to get rid of us, but to work together. Thank you.

Professor Lynn Phillips: I’ve advised thousands of students and was also on the Communication undergraduate studies committee when we developed our proposal for our curriculum change. I’ve been involved in the development of SBS Pathways, as well. One distinction that I’d like to draw is between opportunity and requirement. There’s been a lot of conversation about the proposed revisions taking away students’ opportunities to take language courses; that couldn’t be further from the truth. We advisors in SBS very much believe in language study and we will continue to encourage students to take language courses; that’s different than requiring all of our students to take language courses. One of things that I think is particularly important about this change of requirements is the opening up of opportunities for students to pursue a range of different pathways including internships, undergraduate research, study abroad programs, and other opportunities. In the Department of Communication, 40% of our incoming students are transfer students and many of them really struggle to get in their language classes so they end up taking summer classes because they can’t get into the courses here and this shuts out those opportunities for other pathways that the students may want to pursue. So, this change would open up those different pathways for students and language study would be among those possibilities; there’s nothing in
this proposal that would close off that option. The other thing that I want to say is about transfer students; for most of them, transferring is about economics. They may have started at a community college to make the four-year degree more affordable or they’ve come back home to UMass because they couldn’t afford the school where they were. So, for those transfer students to have a delayed time to degree in order to fit the current requirements in and forego other options like internships that will help them down the road and to take courses outside of UMass at a greater expense to them, this is very much a social class issue as well as an issue of opportunity for all of our students.

**Senator Bruce Baird:** In roughly the year 1600, a new totalitarian government came to power in Japan. They instituted a maritime prohibition whereby people were not allowed to come into Japan and Japanese people were not allowed to go out with the idea of freezing their society. It worked but the world didn’t stop; it rarely does. In 1853, when Japan rejoined the world, they found that technology had surpassed them and ideas had surpassed them. There was utilitarianism. There was democracy. They had to figure out words for these things. We’re at a similar juncture, in a way, and here we have a proposal, that is couched in the rhetoric of opportunity, to do away with language requirement and precisely make it so our students are less able to be good citizens of the world that they belong to, and I find that a little bit troubling. For that reason, I encourage you to vote against this proposal. But, one of the stated reasons for this proposal has been that it is better for low-income and minority students who have trouble meeting the requirements and how could we be against such a proposal that is couched in these social class terms? I was having a chat with Becky Packard of Mt. Holyoke College – many of you many know her – and her research is in issues like this; she was telling me that, at the University of Michigan, they were noticing a drop-off in their calculus courses with low-income and minority students, so they could have just gotten rid of the calculus requirement but instead what they decided to do was to zoom in and figure out what they could do to catch the students that they were missing. In fact, they made a new course for the students who failed their first calculus test; in this method, they were able to get these students’ results up to the appropriate levels by figuring out a different option rather than just getting rid of the calculus requirement. So, I think that what we need to think about here is an option for meeting the requirement that we think that a good R1 research institution should have rather than just getting rid of the requirement. Thank you.

**Senator Anthony Paik:** I want to respond to that comment. I think that forming the ad hoc committee is exactly the right way to approach this problem, by examining the role of language and language proficiency as a policy matter and as an academic matter; I support the idea of the ad hoc committee looking into these questions. I just want to remind people that the SBS Global Education requirement, which I’ve become more and more familiar with over my time here at the University, is not just a language requirement but a fifteen-credit requirement including nine credits that are not necessarily just language courses. So, when we’re talking about barriers to graduation, we’re not just talking about two classes but fifteen credits, which is a considerable set of course requirements that SBS majors have to take on in addition to their major requirements. The last piece that I will emphasize is that the Global Education requirement is an SBS requirement, not a University requirement, and this was a decision that was agreed to by the faculties of those departments. Thank you.

**Senator Maria Tymoczko:** It seems to me that given the current era in which we’re moving toward isolationism in this country and given that the world order seems to be changing in the sense that there is good chance that we’re moving away from the hegemony of English and the U.S. as well, which are not necessarily terrible things, this is a very inauspicious time for us to be changing and diluting our language requirements and our understanding of other countries and internationalism. Particularly, I think that this would be a bad thing here in Massachusetts.

**Provost John McCarthy:** I heard various concerns today and also in previous discussions in the Senate. I’ve also heard concerns from the Graduate Student Senate officers and I want to address some of them. First, with respect to the graduate students, we will honor offer letters that were made to graduate students; we’re not going to lay off graduate students who have offer letters and we’re going to honor the offers that we made them. Second, it is by no means obvious that we will have to cut back on any language instruction whatsoever; we don’t know exactly what is going to happen with this. Third, we don’t have RCM; we do not have a system that automatically and formulaically reallocates budget and faculty lines according to shifts in enrollment. Every time that we think about any kind of allocation or reallocation of faculty lines, we are looking at the whole picture, not just enrollment, but at our areas of traditional strength where we can build up. We are a comprehensive R1 university and we aren’t going to turn into an engineering school or institute of technology. So, the kinds of concerns in that regard do not
actually have a solid foundation. I’ve also heard a number of times about access to language courses and I think that there was a particular problem in Spanish course access in the fall; Vice Provost Carol Barr and I looked into that very closely and I also discussed this with Julie Hayes, the Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA). It is not a problem of having insufficient instructional resources; it was not that they didn’t have enough faculty or teaching assistants or teaching associates to cover the courses but that they didn’t plan exactly right for the kinds of enrollment that they were getting in this particular era of the Spanish program. The Spanish program has not endured cuts in its instructional resources so I don’t see that being a reason to vote against this.

**Senator Ina Ganguli:** I will echo Senator Paik’s point a bit, but as background, I am an economist but as an undergraduate student I minored in German and then studied Russian and Ukrainian as a graduate student, so I really feel strongly about languages. With regard to the current Global Education requirement and what this change would mean, that part of the curriculum would go to the departments and I was assured that if students want to take languages to fulfill the requirement they will still be able to do so. Taking the language will fulfill the requirement. Also, I think that the ad hoc committee looking into language proficiency across campus is something that will be very fruitful and will continue to place emphasis on internationalization. Thank you.

**Professor Mari Castañeda:** I am the Chair of the Communication Department and I want to speak in favor of the proposal. This summer I had the opportunity to take fifteen students to the Dominican Republic. Some of the students were SBS students and some were from other schools and colleges; only one student spoke Spanish but it was a phenomenal experience for them, to be able to travel with a faculty member who also is bilingual, coming from a Chicana background and speaking fluent Spanish. I really had a wonderful experience with these students along with the Director of CECIL, an experience seeing what it means to travel internationally and academically and to do a community-based project in the Dominican Republic. As a result of that experience, several of those students will be travelling abroad next spring and next year. For me, as the Chair of the Communication Department, I’m excited about the possibility of bringing that to our Department and making us accountable for trying to internationalize and have our classes and students throughout the academic year experience what it means to be a global citizen because honestly language alone is not going to cut it. I see students, over the years, take these language classes and not necessarily have the transformative experience that is necessary for them to really be able to think of themselves in this global context but I did see it with those students that I travelled abroad with this summer; they were rising sophomores and I can see them, in their next three years here at UMass, seeing themselves as being able to cross different borders and really be excited about what they’re going to be doing when they leave UMass. I want to be able to do that with our students in our department in ways that are meaningful and transformative, not necessarily just limited to language; I think there are so many wonderful ways that we can do this and I am excited about the possibility of challenging the departments to be able to do that.

**Senator Graciela Monteagudo:** Earlier, I spoke in favor of the motion to create the ad hoc committee. Now, I’d like to speak in favor of the SBS proposal. In my experience as Associate Director of the STPEC program and also an advisor for many of my students, it is an issue of class and it is an issue of not being able to fulfill the requirement and not being able to graduate on time. One student, who is twenty-one years old, went to school on the Cape here in Massachusetts; he took four years of Spanish but could not test into any of the Spanish classes. When he tried to take classes at Amherst College he was not able to because the bus schedules had been modified and the classes did not fit with his schedule. Another student put himself through community college while working at Yankee Candle; he saved a chunk of money but he is now taking a Spanish class at Greenfield Community College because he couldn’t test into the classes here. This is a situation that SBS cannot modify on its own. That’s why we are supporting the creation of the committee to look into a language requirement for the whole campus and would look into ways of funding languages, not only thinking about internationalization, which is so important, and not only thinking about making UMass the best possible University and reaching the top-twenty goal that we want to reach, but also thinking of Spanish as a language of the United States. Our students should be able to go to Holyoke and speak with people there, and they cannot do that right now, even with the best of intentions. We have lots of students who do internships in Springfield and Holyoke but they cannot get into the Spanish classes. So, my request to the Faculty Senate is that you take this into account; take into account that we are not going to drop the need for language. We will all work toward having this committee function and be able to develop something that will make sense for the whole campus but not impact the students that need to graduate on time and not make them go into further debt as is the case now. Thank you.
**Senator Richard Bogartz:** My learned colleague Professor Baird mentioned some events in Japan around 1600. At just about the same time, or maybe a little later, I was in high school where I studied Spanish. Then, I went to college and studied French and German. Then, I went to graduate school where I studied Russian. Then, I got a job and the opportunity arose for me to go to the Army Language School in Monterrey to do some more Russian studying and I did that. I’ve had a lot of experience with language. By the way, I’m currently using Duolingo, the application on my iPhone, to restudy Spanish and Duolingo informs me that I’m 38% fluent in Spanish, but you should know that there’s no way that I believe that although it makes me feel good. When the proposals came from SBS and the SBS departments to the Academic Priorities Council, we thought about them and made suggestions about changes, which were dutifully agreed to. I had some sense of possible impacts that they might have on HFA, but, as arrogant as I might be, I still felt that it wasn’t my place to tell eight departments and a college that I know better than them what’s good for their students. It seemed to me that they probably know what’s good for their students better than I do and since this was a perfectly appropriate proposal and there is no University-wide rule concerning a language requirement, at this point in time, it seems to me perfectly appropriate to go ahead and approve this. If at some future point it’s decided by the University to change the requirements across the board, then so be it, and we can consider that at that time. But, at this point in time, I see no reason not to vote “Yes” on this motion.

**Senator Maria Tymoczko:** By contrast, I am in the business of thinking about languages and cross-cultural understanding. It seems to me that we’re putting the cart before the horse if we vote this measure and then have a committee to study it afterward, so I’d like to make a motion to table this until we have the report of the committee that we just formed.

**Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** Tabling the motion sends it out into the universe to some place where it may be hard to retrieve. Do you wish to postpone this motion indefinitely?

**Senator Tymoczko:** No, my motion is to postpone until we have the report from the committee that we just formed to study these issues.

**Presiding Officer Hugus:** In other words, you’re moving to postpone to a certain time. Is there a second? It has been moved and seconded that we postpone this until the ad hoc committee makes its report. This is a debatable motion, so if you want to postpone or you do not wish to postpone, you’re welcome to speak at this time.

**Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** I think that we should vote against this motion to postpone. Indeed, the faculty of SBS have worked very hard for two years thinking about what’s best for their students and have put forward a very thoughtful proposal that has been considered by various councils. SBS has taken into account the councils’ suggestions and I think that we’d be doing our students a disservice by postponing this now. I think that the committee that has been created is a good committee, which will consider the larger issue for the whole campus, which can be taken up and should be taken up at the appropriate time. Thank you.

**Senator Steven Brewer:** Just to amplify what Chancellor Subbaswamy said, I think that this isn’t just about the language issue as there is a bunch of other things in here. A bunch of thought has gone into this project and I think that holding it up on this one issue at this point doesn’t make a lot of sense. We now have the ad hoc committee, we recognize that this is an important issue, and that process should go forward at the University level, not with regard to this one college and its college requirements. I’ve been torn about this issue since the College of Natural Sciences was formed and there was a process that went through and, in the end, we decided to not have a language requirement simply because there are so many things that students might want to specialize in that to require students to specialize in a language seemed to not necessarily be the best thing for every student. Seeing that SBS has gone through a similar process and thought about the issue in the same way, I’m still torn about the issue which is why I’m very glad that we’re going to have a
process to look at it at a University-wide level, but it doesn’t seem to me that holding one college hostage while we consider that makes a lot of sense.

*John McCarthy, Acting Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs:* In my academic career, I’ve done formal study of ten different languages, so I yield to none in admiration for the study of languages, but I think it is wrong to table this motion again. This motion was tabled before and to table it now to allow for the creation of the development of a proposal for a campus-wide language requirement, a proposal that was never brought before this body, would be dilatory.

*Julie Caswell, Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences:* As you know, our College has been working on this proposal for three or four years, now; we started in 2013. We submitted all of the nine proposals to the Course and Curriculum Management System (CCMS) in the beginning of March 2016. We are now at December 14, 2017 and we respectfully request a vote on the merits of our proposals.

*Presiding Officer Hugus:* Does anyone else wish to speak on the motion to postpone definitely? Seeing no one, we’ll come to a vote. I should point out that, in this case, the motion to postpone definitely requires a two-thirds vote. The nays have it.

The motion to postpone to a certain time was defeated.

*Senator Anthony Butterfield:* I think that my remarks will parallel those of Senator Bogartz. I did go to high school in the previous millennium but it wasn’t in the seventeenth century. While I am speaking in favor of the motion, I would like to add that personally I think that all of the undergraduate students at UMass should be required to take a second language for some of the same reasons that Senator Bogartz mentioned. I’ve lived overseas twice in my life in countries where English was not the first language spoken although lucky for me, in many cases it was the second language so we got by. But, I’m pretty sure that linguistically speaking the United States is one of the most culturally deprived countries on the face of the Earth, since most of us can only speak one language, which I think works to our disadvantage in this global economy. Further, to paraphrase the German philosopher Emanuel Kant, when a person knows only one language that person does not know that language. To understand the world we must reach out and understand other parts of the world, not just our own. I’m on the Program and Budget Council and this issue has been thoroughly discussed; I must commend SBS in general and Associate Dean Caswell in particular for their efforts and for supplying us with additional information in a timely manner as we investigated this issue thoroughly. I’m speaking in support of the motion primarily because, again, I think that the faculty in each department and college are most qualified to determine the curriculum and courses for their students. Again, the SBS faculty created their current requirement, which is the toughest on campus. They did it; we didn’t make them do it. They did what they thought was best at the time it was instituted. Now, they have rethought that and come up with a different way to approach international and intercultural issues; I think they have the right to make that decision, so I speak in favor of the motion. Thank you.

*Senator Marta Calás:* I basically do not agree or disagree with anything that has been said. This is a really tough issue and I am not convinced one way or the other because there are millions of details that we haven’t talked about. What worries me is that, in not talking about those details, we are making assumptions that at times seem to define the discussion and that in itself is problematic. In particular, I refer to the issue of class and what difference it makes. People who are less affluent and may be taking longer to graduate for whatever reason suffer in particular; I agree that limiting that level of suffering is important and that therefore we should be mindful in public education when it comes to helping students arrive at graduation in the best way possible and as soon as possible. On the other hand, there is the reasoning that students have the opportunity to go abroad and become totally immersed in a different society, even if it is for a couple of weeks, doing something good, but right there we are talking about the question of class; who are those students who can actually go abroad and benefit from that experience? Who can actually travel? When we say that, instead of studying languages, students may travel and see the world, they may, in some cases, wind up in a program in Spain that is all in English and that is really naïve. I would like for this program to be approved because the program actually does something special that contributes to the growth of the
students in a way that could not be accomplished currently, but I would rather not have the question of class invoked in favor of this because that is a much more complicated issue. Thank you.

**Senator Graciela Monteagudo:** I’d like to speak more precisely about the issue of class. I am a working-class woman. My mother was the bastard child of a family of fourteen children who grew up with no shoes and on a dirt floor. So, when I speak for my low-income students, I’m really speaking for my low-income students. We created, in Social Thought and Political Economy (STPEC), a program that, last year, took ten students to Argentina for a whole semester and it cost them less than attending UMass. Everything that they received as scholarships or tuition waivers or whatever it was transferred to the Universidad Nacional de San Martin in Buenos Aires and not only were we able to support ten of our students going abroad, but, on a secondary note, we were able to transfer about $40,000 to the Argentinian economy, so there was also a flipside in that we were able to do that social justice work in that way. With regard to learning the language, some classes were in English, but the students also had Spanish classes and lived in the homes of people who spoke only Spanish. I think that this is an issue of class but it is also an issue of the SBS faculty trying to do the best for our students. We are not trying to hide the details but it is not a detail that many of our students cannot continue with the language that they have studied in the past and many of them have huge difficulties trying to learn a second language which would be something that would be open to them at UMass because the issue has been mostly one of testing into Spanish. So, it is an issue of class and I don’t want that to be swept under the rug because it pains me to think that somebody might think that the faculty at SBS don’t really care and are using this as an excuse to get rid of a requirement. We really do care and we care that our students graduate on time and with the least amount of debt possible. If we have to sacrifice something in the meantime, we will have to, but that’s why we are also supporting the creation of the campus-wide committee that would look into the issue for every college and school and not just SBS. Thank you.

**Senator Janice Telfer:** I call the question.

**Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** The question has been called. Is there a second? There is. This comes to an immediate vote and requires a two-thirds majority. All those in favor of stopping debate by calling the question please say “Aye.” Those opposed say “Nay.” The chair hears no “nays.” The motion to call the question was adopted.

**Presiding Officer Hugus:** Therefore the question is closed and we come to an immediate vote on the main motion. All those in favor. All those in favor please say “Aye.” All those opposed say “Nay.” The chair judges that the “Ayes” have it and the motion passes.

The main motion was adopted.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

| A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda. |


(Tabled from the April 27, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting)

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning 2) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Department of Anthropology, 3) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Department of Communication, 4) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Department of Economics, 5) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Department of Journalism, 6) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Program in Legal Studies, 7) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Program in Political Science, 8) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Social Thought and Political Economy, and 9) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Major Requirements in the Department of Sociology, as presented in Sen. Docs. No. 17-060, 17-061, 17-062, 17-063, 17-064, 17-065, 17-066 and 17-067, respectively.

The motion was adopted.

The 773rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m. on December 14, 2017.